



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/772,182   | 02/03/2004  | Hank Risan           | MRT-022             | 4668             |
| 76/407 7590 08/09/2011<br>MEDIA RIGHTS TECHNOLOGIES C/O WAGNER BLECHER LLP<br>123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE<br>WATSONVILLE, CA 95076 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| HOLDER, BRADLEY  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 2439   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 08/09/2011   |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/772,182

**Applicant(s)**

RISAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

BRADLEY HOLDER

**Art Unit**

2439

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to applicant's request for continuing examination filed on June 30, 2011 for Application # 10/772182 filed on February 3, 2004 in which claims 1-16 are pending.

### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-16 are pending, of which Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huffman et al. US Patent Application No. 2005/0086397 in view of Feldman et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115147 and further in view of Fiacconi et al. US Patent No. 4,862,354.

Regarding Claim 1, Huffman et al. discloses:

*A method for providing a media change notification* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Figure 2)] *on a computing system comprising: polling a media device of a computing system for a media change wherein said polling of said media device by said computing system;* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7) where Huffman et al. teaches the polling of a media device for a media change on a computer system]

*detecting a media change on said media device;* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4) where Huffman et al. teaches the detection of a change of the media]

*generating a media change notification when said media change is detected;* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2) where Huffman et al. teaches the creation and transmission of a message indicating that a media change has occurred]

*and outputting said media change notification when said media change on said media device is detected wherein said media change notification by said computing*

*system.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7) where Huffman et al. teaches outputting or transmission of a message indicating that a media change has occurred on a computing system]

Huffman et al. does not appear to explicitly disclose:

*said media change notification distinct from and operating in parallel with an autorun protocol component of said computing system;*

polling for or receiving a message from a device that *cannot be blocked* or *cannot be obstructed* by the computer system

However, Feldman et al. discloses:

*said media change notification distinct from and operating in parallel with an autorun protocol component of said computing system;* [see (Feldman et al. Paragraph 433 Lines 1-35; Figure 23A) where Feldman et al. teaches a computing system with a media change or auto-insert notification which is separate and distinct from and operates in parallel or in conjunction with an autorun handler protocol component]

Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. are analogous art because they are from the “same field of endeavor” and are from the same “problem-solving area,”. Namely, they are both from the field of “information security”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Huffman et al. and the teachings of Feldman et al. by providing a computing system with a media change or auto-Insert notification which is separate and distinct from and operates in parallel or in conjunction with an autorun handler protocol component.

The motivation for doing so would be to increase the usability and flexibility of Huffman et al. by providing a computing system with a media change or auto-Insert notification which is separate and distinct from and operates in parallel or in conjunction with an autorun handler protocol component as taught by Feldman et al. in the teaching described by Huffman et al. so as to provide the functionality of media change notifications independently and at the same time as media autorun capabilities to further improve a user's viewing experience as content is selected and played for a user]

The combination of Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. does not appear to explicitly disclose:

polling for or receiving a message from a device that *cannot be blocked* or *cannot be obstructed* by the computer system

However, Fiacconi et al. discloses:

polling for or receiving a message from a device that *cannot be blocked* or *cannot be obstructed* by the computer system [see (Fiacconi et al. Abstract Lines 1-17; Column 6 Lines 41-50) where Fiacconi et al. teaches a computer system that polls for or

receives messages from a device in which the polling or receipt of messages cannot be blocked or obstructed by the computer system by the locking of the polling or message receipt operations and the prevention of the execution of other operations during the time of the locked polling or message receipt operations]

Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. are analogous art because they are from the *“same field of endeavor” and are from the same “problem-solving area,”. Namely, they are all from the field of “information security”.*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. and the teachings of Fiacconi et al. by providing a computer system that polls for or receives messages from a device in which the polling or receipt of messages cannot be blocked or obstructed by the computer system by the locking of the polling or message receipt operations and the prevention of the execution of other operations during the time of the locked polling or message receipt operations as taught by Fiacconi et al. in the teaching described by Huffman et al. and Feldman et al.

The motivation for doing so would be to increase the usability and flexibility of Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. by providing a computer system that polls for or receives messages from a device in which the polling or receipt of messages cannot be blocked or obstructed by the computer system by the locking of the polling or message receipt operations and the prevention of the execution of other operations during the time of the locked polling or message receipt operations as taught by Fiacconi et al. in

the teaching described by Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. so as to provide the additional capability of initiating polling or message receipt operations between a computer system and a device that cannot be interrupted, blocked, or obstructed by the computer system thereby increasing the reliability and consistency of the polling or message receipt operations.

Regarding Claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 1 wherein said media change notification is performed by a kernel level component* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-11; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media change notification polling and response utilizes Direct Memory Access on the host bus with interrupt notification which requires the use of a kernel level component of the Operating System]

Regarding Claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 1 wherein said media change notification is performed by a user level component.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 27 Lines 1-11) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media change notification utilizes interaction with



the user and as a result requires the use of a user level component of the Operating System]

Regarding Claim 4, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 1 wherein said media change notification is performed by modifying a media-polling component of an operating system [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 8-17) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media-polling component of the Operating System needs modification in order to support asynchronous media change notification]*

Regarding Claim 5, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 4 wherein said modifying of said media polling component in said operating system comprises: utilizing said media polling component to poll each said media device coupled with said computing system for content regardless of any input to said media polling component by said computing system. [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-11; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7; Paragraph 35 Lines 8-17; Paragraph 39 Lines 1-8) where Huffman et al. teaches the modified media polling component of the operating system polls each or multiple*

media devices in the computing system and receives notification via an interrupt regardless of inputs to the media polling component]

Regarding Claim 6, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 1 wherein said media change notification is performed by a second component operating parallel to a first component in an operating system.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 1-10; Figure 6) where Huffman et al. teaches a first component of a synchronous poll and a second component of an asynchronous poll or message operating in parallel to provide the media change or status notification]

Regarding Claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 6. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 6 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 6 wherein said first component in said operating system polls said media device for content and can be disabled by said computing system* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 1-10; Figure 6) where Huffman et al. teaches a first component of a synchronous poll to provide the media content or status notification that can be disabled by the computing system],

*and said second component operating parallel to said first component in said operating system polls said media device for content and cannot be disabled by said computing system.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 1-10; Figure 6) where Huffman et al. teaches a second component of a asynchronous poll or message operating in parallel to provide the media content or status notification that cannot be disabled by the computing system]

Regarding Claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The method as recited in claim 1 wherein said media change is an introduction of media to said media device of said computing system.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media change is an introduction or insertion of a tape cartridge into the media or storage device]

Regarding Claim 9, Huffman et al. discloses:

*A non-transitory computer readable medium for storing computer implementable instructions, said instructions for causing a client system to perform a method for providing a media change notification* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Figure 2)] *on a computing system comprising: polling a media device for a media change wherein said polling of said media device;* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2;

Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7) where Huffman et al. teaches the polling of a media device for a media change on a computer system]

*detecting a media change on said media device;* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4) where Huffman et al. teaches the detection of a change of the media]

*generating a media change notification when said media change is detected;* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2) where Huffman et al. teaches the creation and transmission of a message indicating that a media change has occurred]

*and outputting said media change notification when said media change on said media device is detected wherein said media change notification.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-15; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7) where Huffman et al. teaches outputting or transmission of a message indicating that a media change has occurred on a computing system]

Huffman et al. does not appear to explicitly disclose:

*said media change notification distinct from and operating in parallel with an autorun protocol component of said computing system;*

*polling for or receiving a message from a device that cannot be blocked or cannot be obstructed by the computer system*

However, Feldman et al. discloses:

*said media change notification distinct from and operating in parallel with an autorun protocol component of said computing system; [see (Feldman et al. Paragraph 433 Lines 1-35; Figure 23A) where Feldman et al. teaches a computing system with a media change or auto-Insert notification which is separate and distinct from and operates in parallel or in conjunction with an autorun handler protocol component]*

Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. are analogous art because they are from the *"same field of endeavor" and are from the same "problem-solving area,". Namely, they are both from the field of "information security".*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Huffman et al. and the teachings of Feldman et al. by providing a computing system with a media change or auto-Insert notification which is separate and distinct from and operates in parallel or in conjunction with an autorun handler protocol component.

The motivation for doing so would be to increase the usability and flexibility of Huffman et al. by providing a computing system with a media change or auto-Insert notification which is separate and distinct from and operates in parallel or in conjunction with an autorun handler protocol component as taught by Feldman et al. in the teaching described by Huffman et al. so as to provide the functionality of media change notifications independently and at the same time as media autorun capabilities to further improve a user's viewing experience as content is selected and played for a user]

The combination of Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. does not appear to explicitly disclose:

polling for or receiving a message from a device that *cannot be blocked* or *cannot be obstructed* by the computer system

However, Fiacconi et al. discloses:

polling for or receiving a message from a device that *cannot be blocked* or *cannot be obstructed* by the computer system [see (Fiacconi et al. Abstract Lines 1-17; Column 6 Lines 41-50) where Fiacconi et al. teaches a computer system that polls for or receives messages from a device in which the polling or receipt of messages cannot be blocked or obstructed by the computer system by the locking of the polling or message receipt operations and the prevention of the execution of other operations during the time of the locked polling or message receipt operations]

Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. are analogous art because they are from the “*same field of endeavor*” and are from the same “*problem-solving area*,”. Namely, they are all from the field of “*information security*”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. and the teachings of Fiacconi et al. by providing a computer system that polls for or receives messages from a device in which the polling or receipt of messages cannot be blocked

or obstructed by the computer system by the locking of the polling or message receipt operations and the prevention of the execution of other operations during the time of the locked polling or message receipt operations as taught by Fiacconi et al. in the teaching described by Huffman et al. and Feldman et al.

The motivation for doing so would be to increase the usability and flexibility of Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. by providing a computer system that polls for or receives messages from a device in which the polling or receipt of messages cannot be blocked or obstructed by the computer system by the locking of the polling or message receipt operations and the prevention of the execution of other operations during the time of the locked polling or message receipt operations as taught by Fiacconi et al. in the teaching described by Huffman et al. and Feldman et al. so as to provide the additional capability of initiating polling or message receipt operations between a computer system and a device that cannot be interrupted, blocked, or obstructed by the computer system thereby increasing the reliability and consistency of the polling or message receipt operations.

Regarding Claim 10, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 9. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 9 wherein said media change notification is performed by a kernel level component.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-11; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 18 Lines 1-2; Paragraph

28 Lines 6-7) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media change notification polling and response utilizes Direct Memory Access on the host bus with interrupt notification which requires the use of a kernel level component of the Operating System]

Regarding Claim 11, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 9. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 9 wherein said media change notification is performed by a user level component.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 27 Lines 1-11) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media change notification utilizes interaction with the user and as a result requires the use of a user level component of the Operating System]

Regarding Claim 12, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 9. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 9 wherein said media change notification is performed by modifying a media polling component of an operating system.* [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 8-17) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media-polling component of the Operating System needs modification in order to support asynchronous media change notification]



Regarding Claim 13, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 12. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 12 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 12 wherein said modifying of said media polling component in said operating system comprises: utilizing said media polling component to poll each said media device coupled with said computing system for content regardless of any input to said media polling component by said computing system. [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 15 Lines 10-11; Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4; Paragraph 28 Lines 6-7; Paragraph 35 Lines 8-17; Paragraph 39 Lines 1-8) where Huffman et al. teaches the modified media polling component of the operating system polls each or multiple media devices in the computing system and receives notification via an interrupt regardless of inputs to the media polling component]*

Regarding Claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 9. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 9 wherein said media change notification is performed by a second component operating parallel to a first component in an operating system. [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 1-10; Figure 6) where Huffman et al. teaches a first component of a synchronous poll and a second component of an asynchronous poll or message operating in parallel to provide the media change or status notification]*

Regarding Claim 15, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 14. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 14 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 14 wherein said first component in said operating system polls said media device for content and can be disabled by said computing system, [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 1-10; Figure 6) where Huffman et al. teaches a first component of a synchronous poll to provide the media content or status notification that can be disabled by the computing system]*

*and said second component operating parallel to said first component in said operating system polls said media device for content and cannot be disabled by said computing system. [see (Huffman et al. Paragraph 35 Lines 1-10; Figure 6) where Huffman et al. teaches a second component of a asynchronous poll or message operating in parallel to provide the media content or status notification that cannot be disabled by the computing system]*

Regarding Claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 9. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, the combination of Huffman et al., Feldman et al., and Fiacconi et al. discloses:

*The non-transitory computer readable medium of claim 9 wherein said media change is an introduction of media to said media device of said computing system. [see*

(Huffman et al. Paragraph 17 Lines 1-4) where Huffman et al. teaches that the media change is an introduction or insertion of a tape cartridge into the media or storage device]

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2011 have been fully considered but are not fully persuasive.

On Pages 5-9 of the Applicant's Response, applicants argue that Huffman et al. does not teach the applicants limitations of "polling a media device of a computing system for a media change wherein said polling of said media device cannot be blocked by said computing system", as recited in Claim 1, and similarly in Claim 9.

Applicant's arguments regarding the limitations of "polling a media device of a computing system for a media change wherein said polling of said media device cannot be blocked by said computing system", as recited in Claim 1, and similarly in Claim 9 are rendered moot due to the application of additional prior art in the rejection of these claim limitations thereby providing a new ground of rejection. The previous 103(a) rejections on claims 1, 9 are withdrawn and replaced with 103(a) rejections on claims 1, 9 with additional prior art.

Therefore, in view of the above reasons, Examiner maintains 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections on Claims 1, 9.

On Page 9 of the Applicant's Response, applicants argue that since dependent Claims 2-8, 10-16 depend on independent Claims 1, 9, the 103(a) rejections on dependent Claims 2-8, 10-16 should be withdrawn.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments because since 103(a) rejections on independent Claims 1, 9 are maintained, 103(a) rejections on dependent Claims 2-8, 10-16 are also maintained.

Therefore, in view of the above reasons, Examiner maintains 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections on Claims 1-16.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRADLEY HOLDER whose telephone number is (571)270-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00AM-7:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Edan Orgad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439